

REMARKS

Claim 1-20 are pending in the present application.

The Applicant filed the original application on April 5, 2001.

The Examiner mailed the first, non-final Office Action dated September 24, 2004, wherein claims 1-5, 7-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Krishna.

The Examiner mailed a second, non-final Office Action dated March 24, 2005, wherein claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of King.

The Examiner mailed a third, non-final Office Action dated September 8, 2005, wherein claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boneh in view of Jones.

The Examiner mailed a fourth, final Office Action dated June 2, 2006, wherein claims 1-20 remain rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boneh in view of Jones.

The Examiner mailed an Advisory Action dated September 28, 2006 maintaining the rejection in the final Office Action dated June 2, 2006.

The Examiner mailed a fifth, final Office Action dated January 24, 2007, wherein claims 1-20 remain rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boneh in view of Jones.

The amendment and remarks herein are in response to the fifth Office Action.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boneh, et al (Pub. No. 2002/0112167) (Boneh) in view of Jones, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,800) (Jones).

The applicant respectfully amends the present independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 15 to overcome the present rejection. The applicant respectfully submits that the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the references cited by the Examiner are not such that the subject matter, as a whole, would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

As succinctly stated in the MPEP, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be satisfied:

“First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claimed limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on the applicant’s disclosure.” Section 706.02(j) (citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)).

“To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” MPEP 706.02(j) (quoting *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985)).

Teachings of Boneh:

Boneh teaches, in the Abstract: “A method and apparatus are provided for *protecting sensitive information within server* or other computing environments. Numerous electronic requests addressed to a server system are received over network couplings and evaluated. The evaluation scans for sensitive information including credit card information and private user information. Upon detecting sensitive data, *cryptographic operations are applied to the sensitive data*. When the sensitive data is being *transferred to the server system*, the *cryptographic operations encrypt the sensitive data prior to transfer* among components of the server system. When sensitive data is being *transferred from the server system*, the *cryptographic operations decrypt the sensitive data prior to transfer* among the network couplings. The cryptographic operations also include hash, and keyed hash operations.” (emphasis added)

Boneh teaches that one or more TE Appliances (e.g., 102, 202, 204) perform the encryption and/or decryption.

Boneh teaches that function of the TE Appliances may be dedicated network appliances or distributed among various associated network components (page 2, par. 0027)

Boneh teaches: “When the TE Appliance identifies tags indicating that the associated data is sensitive, it applies an *appropriate cryptographic operation* to the data within these tags, in block 306. For example, incoming sensitive data is *encrypted using known encryption algorithms* such as know public key infrastructure (“PKI”) encryption algorithms or the Data Encryption Standard (“DES”).” (page 2, par. 29) (emphasis added)

Boneh, at page 5, par. 0061 and 0062, as cited by the Examiner, merely provides a general description of a “processor,” including CPUs, DSPs, and ASICs, and a general description of a “computer-readable media,” respectively.

Teachings of Jones:

Jones teaches three *known encryption algorithms*, including DES and RC5 (both standard IPSEC algorithms), and IDEA (i.e., a PGP encryption algorithm). (col. 5, lines 49-53)

Jones describes an “encryption chip” (see Fig. 2) having an “encryption/decryption pipeline . . . made up of a plurality of processing elements 37 arranged in a linear array, each containing an instruction memory, a register file, an ALU, local and shared data memory, and control circuitry.” Jones, col. 6, ll. 7-13 (emphasis added).

Applicant’s response to the Examiner’s Final Office Action:

The applicant amends claims 1, 7, 12, and 15 to overcome the examiner’s rejection.

For example, claim 1 now claims, among other limitations, the following limitations:

“a multi-layer protocol that may be partitioned into more complex layers and less complex layers”

“the first processor is configured to operate the less complex layers”

“a high performance processor configured to process voice data when the high performance processor is operating a voice service option”

a high performance processor configured to operate one of the more complex layers of the multi-layer protocol for the benefit of the first processor according to a command

received from the first processor when the high performance processor is not operating the voice service option”

“a high performance processor configured to provide a result of the operation of one of the more complex layers to the first processor; and

“a computer-readable medium providing a memory ... to permit the high performance processor to operate the one of the more complex layers of the multi-layer protocol for the benefit of the first processor.”

Support in the present specification for the present amendment and the advantages therefor may be found, for example, at page 7, lines 7-18:

“In a wireless application, the CPU **12** and DSP **14** are typically both present on-board the mobile device. In normal operation, the DSP **14** processes voice data and provide, by way of example, functionality in the mobile device. However, in contrast to the device of the present invention, the DSP **14** is idling whenever it is not operating a voice service option. Therefore, according to the present invention, the DSP **14** off-loads the CPU **12**, which speeds response time while allowing the CPU **12** time to perform other functions for which it is better suited, such as operating user interfaces. Accordingly, the processing time savings to the customer are achieved by the present invention through better utilization of the existing on-board components, without incurring the economic cost of additional equipment.”

In particular, Boneh in view of Jones does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, using a high performance processor to process voice data when the high performance processor is operating a voice service option, and to operate the one of the more complex layers of the multi-layer protocol for the benefit of the first processor when the high performance processor is not operating the voice service option.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of the response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 17-0026. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 24, 2007

By: \Donald C. Kordich\  
Donald C. Kordich  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,213

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-2779  
Telephone: (858) 658-5928  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502